

The Catholic Register,

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY.

AT THE
OFFICE, 40 LOMBARD STREET, TORONTO.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

FOR ADVERTISING RATES APPLY AT OFFICE.

TRAVELLING AGENTS:

Messrs. Patrick Muirgovan, C. N. Murphy,
C. J. Kernahan and L. O'Byrne.

THURSDAY, MAY 10, 1894.

Calendar for the Week.

May 10—Octave of the Ascension of Our Lord.
11—St. Alexander Pope and Martyr.
12—Vigil of Pentecost. Fast Day.
13—Pentecost Sunday.
14—Pentecost Monday.
15—Pentecost Tuesday.
16—Office of the Octave. Ember Day.

The Kingdom of God.

The *Christian Guardian*, in a late number, quoted a learned treatise of Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff on "Romanism and Protestantism Contrasted." Although no editorial remarks accompany the document, it is plain, from the fact of its insertion in the *Guardian*, that Dr. Schaff's views and that pious journal's are identical. Rev. Dr. Schaff lays it down dogmatically "that Protestantism is modern Christianity in motion—Romanism is mediæval Christianity in conflict with modern progress."

The Rev. Doctor and the *Guardian* ought to know very well, without being catechised by us, that there are no two or three christianities. Christianity is the work of God, and was perfect from the beginning. There is such a thing as Ancient History and Mediæval and Modern History. Because history is the work of man, and treats of the manners and customs and passions and conflicts of men and nations, therefore are there changes and improvements and differences of all kinds to be recorded, and the relations between king and subject, between lord and serf, have changed from age to age.

But christianity is the mode of serving God and of worshipping our Creator as taught by the Man-God; and all the truths taught in Christianity are revealed by God, and made known to all men by the Church which He founded on a rock, and against which the gates of Hell (errors of all kinds) never can prevail. To maintain that these truths can change, or that some of them may disappear and novelties be substituted in their stead, or that what was taught by God and His church as true one thousand years ago is no longer true to-day, would be making the God of all truth contradict Himself.

"Modern Christianity in motion" may satisfy the religious cravings of Rev. Dr. Schaff, but is no food for the hungry soul that searches after truth. A Christianity of yesterday, and that changes or is in motion like the weathercock, can not be the unchanging heavenly church which Christ established and the Pentecostal Holy Spirit made perfect nigh two thousand years ago.

But Dr. Philip Schaff should have mentioned the particulars in which Romanism (the Catholic Church he

means) is in conflict with modern progress. Her painters, her poets, her orators, her architects, her astronomers and her men studying and professing the exact sciences, are very numerous, and are abreast, if not in advance, of the progress yet made in any walk of life by men or scholars of the denominations included in the "Christianity in Motion" species.

The Catholic Church is in conflict with modern progress when the teachings of modern progress are erroneous or demoralizing or manifestly opposed to the teachings of Jesus Christ. If Protestantism does not march on the same lines hand in hand, and shoulder to shoulder, with Romanism, so much the worse for society over which the parsons have yet some influence. This influence might be exercised in teaching submission to legal authority, whether of Church or State, in preventing divorce laws; in inculcating, with Christ the Redeemer, the laws of charity, of humility and of self-denial. But this united and uniform method of instilling into the human mind the practical principles of Christianity can never be accomplished while Rev. Doctors of the Schaff school preach the inutility of good works—the slavery of submission to Church authority—the individual infallibility of every man in interpreting Scripture according to his own whims and passions.

Rev. Dr. Schaff and compeers seem to forget the distinction which Christ made between the teachings of Christianity and the maxims of this world. "My kingdom is not of this world," he said. The King of this world is already judged. "The world shall hate you as it hated me." The world cries out with Lucifer, "Non serviam—I will not obey." The world says: "Eat, drink and be merry." Christ says: "Unless you take up your cross and follow Me you shall not be worthy of Me." The world and Dr. Schaff say: Happy are the rich, the powerful and progressive. Christ says: "Blessed are the poor, blessed are the meek, blessed are the clean of heart, for they shall see God."

Congratulations.

An account of the celebrations which took place at Peterborough on the fifth anniversary of the consecration of his Lordship Bishop R. A. O'Connor will be found elsewhere. We join with his priests and people in wishing Bishop O'Connor many happy returns. That they will be many his own appearance gives every confidence—not a grey hair, and just as young as when five years ago he left us with the prayers and good wishes of his many friends in Toronto to take charge of a diocese which he has administered with the care of a faithful, prudent servant. That they will also be happy we are likewise confident; for a pious and zealous clergy in union with a devoted bishop administering God's gifts to a faithful laity must indeed go far to make the pathway of a bishop's life somewhat smooth. All these are to be found in the Bishop, priests and laity of Peterborough.

His Lordship the Bishop of Hamilton celebrated, on the 1st instant, the seventh anniversary of his consecration, and the fifth of his translation to the See of Hamilton. Since his arrival in this diocese two new churches, a fine school house, an excellent pres-

bytery mark the progress of Catholicity in this city, while the whole diocese has advanced in equal pace under his able and zealous administration. We extend to his Lordship Bishop Dowling our congratulations, and our sincere wishes for a continuance of heaven's blessing upon the great work he is doing.

Catholic Lectures in Protestant Colleges.

In an article entitled "Liberality or betrayal, which," the *Canada Presbyterian* fears that so many Roman Catholic priests addressing the students of Protestant Colleges will prove a danger to their religious opinions.

"A contemporary in the United States under the head of 'Editorial Notes,' remarks that, 'When Harvard University invited 'Father O'Callaghan,' a Roman Catholic priest, to preach in Appleton Chapel, before the students, it made a lamentable surrender of the truth of God. The Christian colleges of America were founded to repel and discountenance such errors as those of Romanism.'"

The *Canada Presbyterian* agrees with both the sentiment herein contained and the plain language in which it is stated. It has no sympathy "with that so-called liberality" which induced a Presbyterian minister to invite "an aged and venerable Roman Catholic priest" to address his Sunday school.

"We Presbyterians have been foolish enough to establish at Montreal and maintain at a great cost, a college, the very reason for whose existence was stated to be that it would prove a powerful instrument wherewith to combat popery, that it would dispel the spiritual darkness created by Roman Catholic teaching, and set at liberty those who are enslaved and kept in bondage by it. And it all ends in this, that a R. C. priest is asked, as a brother, to address a Presbyterian congregation in the Church on the Lord's day. If this is not a betrayal, a turning the back upon the spirit and teaching of that college, and of all the arguments urged for its establishment, then we are a deceived people. If such a result of our college teaching were to become common, unless our people should undergo a complete change of view as to the nature and teaching of popery, we should expect to find the channels of their liberalty toward our colleges very speedily become utterly dried up."

Again:

"If, as we believe, we Presbyterians, in our history and doctrine, have been contending in the past for truths of infinite moment as against Popery, to hobnob with her now in the persons of her accredited representatives is practically to make the acknowledgment that all our history and contentings in the past have been a mistake, to capitulate, to go back upon our history and doctrine, and to prepare the way for final surrender. This is not liberalty, it is betrayal."

In conclusion the *Canada Presbyterian* puts the case thus:

"A very important branch of the work of our church, for which we are constantly asked to give and pray, is that of the evangelization of our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen. How could any self respecting Roman Catholic priest accept an invitation to address a Presbyterian congregation, whose minister might on the same day urge upon it as a solemn duty to labour and pray and give for the overthrow of the very system to which the Reverend Father 'who shall address us at a later hour' belongs and is striving with all his might to build up and extend? It won't do. The contradiction, the absurdity, is too glaring, one would think, not to be seen and felt by the most obtuse, of attempting to evangelize Roman Catholics and make them Protestants with the one hand, and to undo this same work with the other. This is not liberalty in any right sense of the word. It is more like the conduct of a sentinel introducing an enemy within the lines. In actual warfare that is not liberalty, and the warfare of our church with Rome we understand to be actual and not a sham; it is called betrayal."

So far as the American Colleges, like Harvard and Yale, are concerned, it is absurd to speak of them as made to repel and discountenance Catholicity. If that is their purpose the only way in which they are fulfilling it is by turning themselves into hotbeds

of irreligion and scepticism. Wheroin is truth surrendered by inviting a Catholic priest to address a body of students? Upon Protestant principle it is but right and proper—for the students, since they as individuals are the judges, have certainly the right to hear what the Catholic Church has to say of herself. Does not Presbyterianism maintain that every man is his own interpreter of God's Word? Then in justice to the students who start off upon that line, it is to be expected that they will have an opportunity of learning something of that Church which, though ever maligned, still stands where she stood in the sixteenth century when Luther, Calvin and Knox withdrew; and away beyond, in the fourth century, when Arius strove to undermine the foundations of Christianity; and where she stood in the first century, when the "Spirit of truth" descended upon her to teach her all truth and to abide with her forever. What is to be feared? Are Presbyterian students to be kept in the dark about the dogma, the moral teaching, and the history of the Catholic Church? A fear is expressed that the supplies will be cut off, the channels of liberalty dried up. Is that a reason for preserving ancient prejudices and false impressions? A truly grand claim for enlightenment! It is ever the same—prejudice dies slowly, and bigotry does not easily give way. Amongst such classes as the *Canada Presbyterian* there is always a desire to be enlightened upon every subject save one—the Catholic Church. To them it is all that is base, corrupt, false, tyrannical, grasping. In their judgment its dogma is the thralldom of intellect, its morals the slavery of heart and will, its sacramental system perversion of soul. In Protestant countries, they claim, it plots against the State, and in Catholic countries it enslaves and crushes the people. Is it any wonder that thoughtful students want to hear a word from the other side? If this is really the character of the Catholic Church is it not strange that generations upon generations of the majority of Christians still profess it? If the *Presbyterian's* view is correct, then will Protestantism shine all the brighter by the contrast between it and a Catholic priest's simple story. To listen to this story is betrayal. Truth can never be betrayed. It may die. In three days it will rise again—to live forever more. We think that the authorities of the different Colleges who from time to time have invited Catholic priests to address their students, so far from betraying any of their principles, have carried them out to their more logical conclusion. What good the speakers have done remains to be seen.

The Queen's Honors.

As Her Majesty's Birthday approaches we are looking for the list of customary favors bestowed upon a few of the prominent sons of Canada who have served their country with devotion and distinction. We have no ambition ourselves for such honours, but we voice countless numbers of our Catholic fellow-citizens throughout Canada when we express the wish that the name of the Hon. Frank Smith will be included in the list of this year. It was a great surprise last year that his name was omitted. His career as an honourable citizen of